

**REMARKS**

The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed November 19, 2004. At the time of the present Office Action, Claims 1 and 3-5 were pending in this application. Claims 1 and 3-5 were rejected.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1, 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 4,945,507 to Ishida, et al (hereinafter "Ishida"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In his rejection, the examiner suggested that Ishida disclosed a system for overflow and saturation processing, particularly pointing out Figure 1 and elements 28, 32, and 22 in Figure 1 as saturation operands. Ishida discloses an adder 10 whose output 22 can be detected for an overflow condition by detector 34. Depending upon the type of overflow condition, overflow detector 34 then directs the selector to forward one of three values (the maximum value 28, the minimum value 32 or the results of the adder 10) to the accumulator 46. The elements 22, 28, 32 and 24 do not act as a saturation logic, as suggested by the examiner. Indeed, the Ishida patent does not even mention the word "saturation." No where within Ishida does it teach or suggest to use the elements 22, 24, 28 and 32 as *saturation* logic. It is respectfully submitted that Ishida does not disclose all of the elements of independent claim 1, and that independent claim 1, and by extension dependent claims 3-5, are allowable over the prior art of records. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

All remarks are made in a good faith effort to advance the prosecution on the merits. Applicant reserves the right to subsequently take up prosecution on the claims as originally filed in this or appropriate continuation, continuation-in-part and/or divisional applications.

Applicant respectfully submits that no amendments have been made to the pending claims for the purpose of overcoming any prior art rejections that would restrict the literal scope of the claims or equivalents thereof.

Applicant respectfully requests that the remarks submitted herein be entered, and further request reconsideration in light of the remarks contained herein.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection, and that there be an early notice of allowance.

**SUMMARY**

In light of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is now in condition for allowance and early notice of the same is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments or suggestions in furtherance of the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the attorney of record by telephone or facsimile.

Applicant believes that there are no fees due in association with the filing of this Response. However, should the Commissioner deem that any fees are due, including any fees for extensions of time, Applicant respectfully requests that the Commissioner accept this as a Petition Therefor, and direct that any and all fees due are charged to Baker Botts L.L.P. **Deposit Account No. 02-0383, (formerly Baker & Botts, L.L.P.) Order Number 068354.1443.**

Respectfully submitted,  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. (023640)

By:   
Ronald L. Chichester  
Reg. No. 36,765  
One Shell Plaza  
910 Louisiana Street  
Houston, Texas 77002-4995  
Telephone: 713.229.1341  
Facsimile: 713.229.7741  
E-Mail: [Ronald.Chichester@bakerbotts.com](mailto:Ronald.Chichester@bakerbotts.com)  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

January 19, 2005